



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the pen is eulogistic, as comparisons are drawn with the colonial régime or more still with the revolutionary days, who can fairly object? These other volumes have much material of value upon the social and economic life of Mexico for the student of that country's history.

The volumes are magnificently produced, with a profusion of half-tones and many full-page color-plates, printed excellently, bound splendidly, and are really *de luxe* in every way.

War Government, Federal and State, in Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Indiana, 1861-1865. By WILLIAM B. WEEDEN. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company. 1906. Pp. xxv, 389.)

THIS volume, by the author of *The Economic and Social History of New England*, presents in rather suggestive fashion an account of "the interplay of the National Union and the State commonwealths, which were principalities in the Civil War" (p. ix). The book is evidently the result of extended and long-continued reading. The author has made much use of the *Official Records* published by the federal government, has consulted the manuscript archives of the state of Massachusetts on many points, and in at least one instance (for Governor Seymour's inaugural message, 1863) he has gone to the original New York archives. He writes not merely as a student of the times which he describes, but as a participant, having served in various posts of artillery command during the early years of the war; and at several points in the narrative (pp. 111, 175, 346) casual mention is made of matters which came within his personal observation and experience.

The scope of the work may best be indicated by a summary of its contents. The opening chapter is entitled "The Genesis of the Union", and deals largely with the varying manifestations of Union and States' Rights sentiments called forth by the slavery question preceding the war. Subsequent chapters deal with "The Executive Crisis" precipitated by the election of Lincoln; the personalities and problems of the "Administration" in the early stages of the armed conflict; "State Support" in the four states named, including the formulation and conversion "from social means to political ends" of "the passionate vehemence of the sympathizing sex" in the Sanitary Commission (p. 126); "Federal and State Interference", which comprises the New York attempts to control the appointment of general officers, together with a long account of the friction between General Butler and Governor Andrew over rival state and federal enlistments in Massachusetts; the "Party Estrangement" following the military miscarriages, Emancipation Proclamation, arbitrary arrests, and corruption in the departments: "The People under Compulsion", dealing with the draft; a chapter on "Government", which continues the subject dealt with in chapter III.; and a final chapter entitled "The Union Vindicated and Developed."

The narrative is never perfunctory, and at times it rises into bril-

liancy; though it must be confessed that a striving for epigram and fine writing, together with defective organization of material, are among the faults of the book. As a business man Mr. Weeden finds it difficult to deal patiently with the short-sighted and unbusinesslike policies which characterized the early stages of the war, and frequent use is made of such terms as "official astigmatism", "bureaucratic obscurantism", "bureau miasma". In particular, the federal administration is censured severely for not accepting all the troops offered by the loyal governors in 1861 and 1862. Even Lincoln is not spared; for while justice is done to his "wise and far-seeing action" in the use of his "reserved prerogatives" (which, with frequent insistence, are derived from the office of king), of his general executive action the author says (p. 68): "He could not execute in the largest sense by care that 'foresees, provides, administers' affairs. Great as his motive might be, his interference in the bureaus became petty and pernicious. Any woman weeping in the White House could get an order pardoning a sentinel for sleeping on post. But that order would cost hundreds or thousands of lives." And again (p. 144): "If Abraham Lincoln had had something more of the same Napoleonic power of action [as Governor Morton, of Indiana], it would have been a great boon to the American executive."

For the work accomplished by Governors Andrew of Massachusetts, Curtin of Pennsylvania, Morgan of New York, and Morton of Indiana he has in the main only words of praise; the governors of the great commonwealths he styles "the only war-ministers the country had or could have, until the pressure of affairs developed Stanton" (p. 74). In his characterization of Morgan (p. 222) we have an excellent comparison of the abilities of the four men: Morgan "perhaps . . . was the best plain executive officer of the four . . . He could not govern, in the sense that Morton and Andrew could forelay state action, or Curtin could carry a whole people through his innate energy. But no one better directed the legitimate forces of the State by official prerogative than did Morgan." On the other hand, the author's contempt and condemnation are outspoken for "Copperheads" and the "dawdling Northern Democrats who vainly tried to build a new party out of their country's agony". Equally trenchant is his criticism of Northern radicals like Wendell Phillips, whom he styles (p. 149) "a political imbecile of the worst sort", who "lived in a sublimated, vitriolic atmosphere that common patriots could not breathe and assimilate".

Many of Mr. Weeden's characterizations and criticisms are shrewd and to the point, showing real insight into the problems of that troublous time and independence of thought in his estimates of men and measures. His judgments, however, are usually impressionistic, and not based on ordered evidence and argument; and where they differ from those, say, of Mr. Rhodes (as in his estimate of the course of the administration with reference to Vallandigham), they fail to carry conviction. The work, in short, is not of monographic character, but is rather a series of

somewhat discursive essays dealing pleasantly and instructively with the subjects of which it treats, while still leaving open the field for a more scientific study of the subject.

The Hayes-Tilden Disputed Presidential Election of 1876. By PAUL LELAND HAWORTH, Lecturer in History, Columbia University. (Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Company. 1906. Pp. xi, 365.)

MR. HAWORTH'S study of the disputed election of 1876 possesses nearly every virtue desirable in a historical work, with one exception. It is based upon an investigation of every possible printed or manuscript source, which, as the author says, may be deemed exhaustive; for, although other sources of information exist, there is little likelihood of their being divulged, since "those actors who could tell the truth . . . will never do so" (p. x). This mass of material has been subjected to an analysis whose minute caution and systematic verification of statements are visible on every page. The author uses foot-notes skilfully, so as to avoid cumbering the page with bulky references while substantiating every important assertion. The conviction is impressed upon the reader that Mr. Haworth, in the search for facts, has come as close to the truth of this exceedingly complicated affair as it is possible for one to attain by historical methods.

Another merit lies in the compact handling of material. In spite of the enormous bulk of his evidence, Mr. Haworth manages to compress every essential fact into 343 pages, leaving out details, yet including many interesting, significant, and amusing brief quotations. The style, too, is admirably clear and graphic. There are few books devoted to a single line of complicated and rather sordid politics which read as entertainingly, largely because of the lucidity and ease of presentation.

Mr. Haworth, in short, has produced what ought to be an authoritative account of the great contested election; yet in view of one peculiar feature of the book it may be doubted whether it can be regarded as final. The monograph is pervaded from cover to cover with a strong bias in favor of the Republican party and against the Democratic. The facts are not concealed or altered, the errors or questionable proceedings of Republicans are not ignored, and every opinion of the author is provided with some recognition of a possible alternative conclusion; but, from start to finish of the long, complicated, and malodorous story, it is perfectly obvious that in Mr. Haworth's eyes the Republican party was uniformly right and the Democratic party uniformly wrong.

The interpretation of the case, according to Mr. Haworth, may be easily summed up: the returning boards were partizan and shameless, but their decisions were within their legal powers and were equitably correct; the contentions of the Democrats against the validity of electoral votes were groundless; the Electoral Commission decided correctly both in law and in equity; the Republican contest to secure the count-